



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,196	04/04/2005	Bruno Bassi	5626	9591

7590 12/20/2005

Charles W Fallow
Shoemaker and Mattare
10 Post Office Road
Suite 100
Silver Spring, MD 20910

EXAMINER

LIN, KUANG Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1725

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

14

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/530,196	Applicant(s) BASSI, BRUNO	
	Examiner Kuang Y. Lin	Art Unit 1725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/4/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1725

1. The specification is objected to under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph in that they appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.
2. It is noted that the status identifier for claims 1-23 is erroneous in that it shall be "cancelled" rather than "amended".
3. The claims are rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph in that they are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. Further, claims 24, 41-43 are reciting the process steps in a reverse sequential manner such that it is not clear what steps are actually claimed. In claims 26 and 34, what zone is referred to? In claim 29, what zone and shaped thickness are referred to? Further, in line 9, there is a lack of antecedent basis in the claim for "the main core box". In claim 33, it referred to "the drawing" such it is not clear what scope is claimed. In claim 34, what "the prints" are referred to? In claim 35, there is a lack of antecedent basis in the claim for "the sand and polymerized resin cores or of the inserts". Further, the expression of "such as" is deemed to render the claimed scope indefinite since it is not clear what scope is covered. In claims 36-38, what further step(s) is/are claimed. Also, what "mobile parts" and "the draft" are referred to. What is "negative prints"? In claim 41, last line, where "at least one seat" is formed? In claim 42, line 9, there is a lack of antecedent basis in the claim for "said at least one valve seat guide". In claims 42-44, respectively, the meaning of last two lines of the claim is not clear. Claim 43 claims an apparatus while process steps are recited.

Art Unit: 1725

Thus, it is not clear what scope is claimed. Further, in line 10, there is a lack of antecedent in the claim for “**said** at least one valve guide”. In claim 44, it is not clear what “means for embedding” is referred to.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 24, 26, 33, 35, 40 and 44 insofar as definite are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by US 4,691,754 to Trumbauer et al.

6. Claim 39 insofar as definite is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by JP 55-98,632.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 27-31, 36 and 38 insofar as definite are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,691,754 to Trumbauer et al.

With respect to claim 27, since it is conventional to injection forming of plastic material, it would have been obvious to injection form the destructible layer of plastic material of ‘ 754 in view of the conventional practice. With respect to claims 28 etc., the core 30 appears to be a cooling jacket core (see, for example, US 4,093,018).

Art Unit: 1725

9. Claim 34 insofar as definite is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,691,754 to Trumbauer et al and further in view of JP 55-98,632.

It would have been obvious to further provide the liner of JP '632 in the process of US '754 to improve the service life of the casting.

10. Claims 25, 32, 37 and 41-43 insofar as definite are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,691,754 to Trumbauer et al. and further in view of JP 63-281,760


It would have been obvious to provide the pin 58a, 58b of JP '760 in the process of US '754 for forming a passage for inserting the valve seat guides. As the pin 58a, 58b are provided in US '754, seats are formed in the plastic material.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuang Y. Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-1179. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:00-6:30,.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas X. Dunn can be reached on 571-272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1725

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kuang Y. Lin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1725

12-13-05